

### REMARKS

Applicant thanks the examiner for the personal interview conducted on May 22, 2003. Claims 1-26 are currently in the case. Claims 1-26 stand rejected. By this amendment, claims 27 and 28 are added to more clearly define elements distinguishing Applicant's invention from the prior art cited by the examiner, as thoroughly discussed in the interview. Applicant believes the language of claims 1-26 renders them allowable as they currently stand. Nevertheless, Applicant has added claims 27 and 28, adding further detail and limitations to the elements recited in claim 1 in order to expedite examination and arrive at an early agreement on allowable subject matter.

Applicant would like to refer the examiner to the interview summary of the previous personal interview conducted on February 26, 2001 with the previous examiner (Mussie Tesfamariam) and supervisor (Jim Trammel). Please note that the Dlugos reference was thoroughly considered and found lacking several of the foregoing recited limitations. The interview summary specifically states that amending the claims to include "executable computer readable medium will overcome the prior art of record." The prior art at the time of the interview included the Dlugos reference.

The claims do not currently read on, nor have ever read on inventory tags, shipping manifests, shop travelers, bar code price tags. However, every office action simply brings up another manufacturer-applied or handler-applied record system for use by a manufacturer or seller on its computers. None of the references provides a product label (clearly a point-of-sale label) coupled with a computer readable medium storing executable content for execution on a processor of the purchaser. From the specification, it is clear that the term "label" means

a point-of-sale label, not to be confused with any convenient tagging system used by a manufacturer or handler typically for its own purposes exclusively.


As was discussed in the personal interview of May 22, 2003, the term "coupled" is currently used in independent claims 1, 11, 18, and 24. This term has also been used in several of newly added claims 27 and 28. The term is used in these claims to show that the "computer readable medium" is physically "coupled" to the product (or product packaging) by the label, rather than simply "linking" the computer readable medium to the label or product by information only.

Applicant maintains that all claims are in condition for allowance and requests the immediate allowance thereof. Applicant once again reiterates that the Examiner has failed to produce a case of prima facie obviousness for the reasons provided in this and the previous responses to office action.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all pending claims and submits that claims 1-28 are in condition for immediate allowance. In the event the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of any of these claims which could be clarified in a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully urged to initiate the same with the undersigned.

DATED this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of June, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

  
A. John Pate  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 36,234

Date: June 3, 2003

PATE PIERCE & BAIRD  
Parkside Tower  
215 South State Street, Suite 550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (801) 530-0330